arXiv:1701.04374v1 [math.GR] 16 Jan 2017

DEGREE OF COMMUTATIVITY FOR RIGHT-ANGLED ARTIN GROUPS

MOTIEJUS VALIUNAS

Abstract. The degree of commutativity of a finite group F, defined as the probability that two randomly chosen elements in F commute, has been studied extensively. Recently [1] this definition was generalised to all finitely generated groups. In this paper the degree of commutativity is computed for right-angled Artin groups with respect to their natural generating set. An additional result concerning sphere sizes of groups with rational spherical growth series (with respect to some finite generating set) is obtained.

1. Introduction

Let F be a finite group. The *degree of commutativity* of F is defined by

$$\mathrm{dc}(F) = \frac{|\{(x,y) \in F^2 \mid [x,y] = 1\}|}{|F|^2}, \tag{1}$$

i.e. the probability that two elements of F chosen uniformly at random commute. In [1], Antolín et al. generalise this definition to infinite finitely generated groups. For this, let G be a group which has a finite generating set X. For any element $g \in G$, let $|g| = |g|_X$ be the length of g with respect to X. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let

$$B_{G,X}(n) = \{g \in G \mid |g|_X \leq n\} \tag{2}$$

be the *ball* in G with respect to X of radius n, and let

$$S_{G,X}(n) = \{g \in G \mid |g|_X = n\} \tag{3}$$

be the *sphere* in G with respect to X of radius n. One writes $B_G(n)$ or $B(n)$ for the ball (and $S_G(n)$ or $S(n)$ for the sphere) if the generating set or the group itself is clear. This was used in [1] to define the *degree of commutativity* for the group G with respect to X as

$$\mathrm{dc}_X(G) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{|\{(x,y) \in B_{G,X}(n)^2 \mid [x,y] = 1\}|}{|B_{G,X}(n)|^2}. \tag{4}$$

Note that if G is finite then for any generating set X one has $B_{G,X}(N) = G$ for some N, so this definition agrees with (1).

Date: January 17, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20P05.

Key words and phrases. Right-angled Artin groups, degree of commutativity, growth series.

The main interest of this paper is the degree of commutativity of *right-angled Artin groups* (often abbreviated as RAAGs). These are groups associated with a finite simple graph Γ and defined by the presentation

$$G_\Gamma = \langle V(\Gamma) \mid [x, y] = 1 \text{ for all } xy \in E(\Gamma)\rangle. \tag{5}$$

If $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ is any subset, then one can consider the subgroup $G_{\Gamma(A)}$ of G_Γ generated by A, called the *special subgroup* of G_Γ associated with A.

This class of groups includes all groups built from the infinite cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}$ by taking direct and free products. In particular, G_Γ is a non-trivial free (resp. direct) product of its special subgroups if and only if the graph Γ (resp. its complement Γ^c) is not connected. However, this class also includes non-cyclic groups that cannot be decomposed as a non-trivial direct or free product, e.g. when Γ is an n-gon for $n \geq 5$ [4].

Note that G_Γ is abelian if and only if Γ is complete. If this is not the case, then $\langle x, y\rangle \leq G_\Gamma$ (for some $x, y \in V(\Gamma)$ not joined by an edge) is a free group of rank 2, as can be shown by considering reduced words in G_Γ [6]. In particular, G_Γ is an exponentially growing group. One would expect such a group to be highly non-abelian, which is confirmed by the main result of this paper:

Theorem 1. *Let Γ be a finite graph. Then*

$$\mathrm{dc}_{V(\Gamma)}(G_\Gamma) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Gamma \text{ is complete,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

To prove this one may use results on the growth of G_Γ. In particular, consider the *spherical growth series* for G_Γ, which is defined for a general group G with a finite generating set X by

$$s_{G,X}(t) = \sum_{g \in G} t^{|g|_X} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |S_{G,X}(n)| t^n; \tag{7}$$

one writes $s_\Gamma(t)$ for $s_{G_\Gamma, V(\Gamma)}(t)$. It was shown by [2] that in fact for any finite graph Γ, the function s_Γ is rational. This implies some nice properties on the growth of G_Γ; in particular:

Proposition 2. *Let G be an infinite group with a finite generating set X such that $s_{G,X}(t)$ is a rational function. Then there exist constants $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $\lambda \in [1, \infty)$ and $D > C > 0$ such that*

$$Cn^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \leq |S_{G,X}(n)| \leq Dn^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \tag{8}$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Together with an explicit form of centralisers in G_Γ, described in [6], Proposition 2 can be used to prove Theorem 1.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 applies to all infinite groups with rational spherical growth series and is dedicated to a proof of Proposition 2. Section 3 is used to prove Theorem 1.

Acknowledgements. *I would like to thank my PhD supervisor, Armando Martino, without whose guidance this paper would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Charles Cox and Enric Ventura for valuable discussions.*

2. Groups with rational growth series

This section provides a proof of Proposition 2. Let G be an infinite group, and suppose that the spherical growth series of G with respect to a finite generating set X is a rational function. In particular, the spherical growth series is

$$s(t) = s_{G,X}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{S}(n)t^n = \frac{p(t)}{q(t)} \tag{9}$$

where $\mathfrak{S}(n) = \mathfrak{S}_G(n) = \mathfrak{S}_{G,X}(n) := |S_{G,X}(n)|$, and

$$q(t) = q_0 t^c \prod_{i=1}^{r}(1-\lambda_i t)^{\alpha_i} \quad \text{and} \quad p(t) = p_0 t^{\tilde{c}} \prod_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}(1-\tilde{\lambda}_i t)^{\tilde{\alpha}_i} \tag{10}$$

are non-zero polynomials with no common roots, with $\alpha_i, \tilde{\alpha}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for all i. Since the series $(\mathfrak{S}(n))_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is growing at most exponentially, $s(t)$ is analytic (and so continuous) at 0, so one has

$$1 = \mathfrak{S}(0) = \lim_{t\to 0} s(t) = \frac{p_0}{q_0} \lim_{t\to 0} t^{\tilde{c}-c} \tag{11}$$

and so $c = \tilde{c}$ and $p_0 = q_0$. Thus, without loss of generality, $c = \tilde{c} = 0$ and $q_0 = p_0 = 1$.

Coefficients of such a series are described in [5, Lemma 1]; in particular, it follows that

$$\mathfrak{S}(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_i - 1} b_{i,j} n^j \lambda_i^n \tag{12}$$

for n large enough, with $b_{i,\alpha_i-1} \neq 0$ for all i.

Now consider the terms of (12) that give a non-negligible contribution to $\mathfrak{S}(n)$ for large n. In particular, one may assume without loss of generality that

$$\lambda := |\lambda_1| = |\lambda_2| = \cdots = |\lambda_{\tilde{k}}| > |\lambda_{\tilde{k}+1}| \geq |\lambda_{\tilde{k}+2}| \geq \cdots \geq |\lambda_r| \tag{13}$$

for some $\tilde{k} \leq r$ and that

$$\alpha := \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \cdots = \alpha_k > \alpha_{k+1} \geq \alpha_{k+2} \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_{\tilde{k}} \tag{14}$$

for some $k \leq \tilde{k}$. Note that one must have $\lambda \geq 1$: otherwise $s(t)$ is analytic at 1 (as its radius of convergence is $\lambda^{-1} > 1$) and so the series $\sum_n \mathfrak{S}(n)$ converges, contradicting the fact that G is infinite.

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, define

$$c_n = \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_{j,\alpha-1} \exp(i\varphi_j n) \tag{15}$$

where $\lambda_j = \lambda \exp(i\varphi_j)$ for some $\varphi_j \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, for $1 \leq j \leq k$. It follows that

$$\mathfrak{S}(n) = n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n(c_n + o(1)) \tag{16}$$

as $n \to \infty$. In particular, since $\mathfrak{S}(n) \in (0, \infty) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ for all n, it follows that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \Re(c_n) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \Im(c_n) = 0. \tag{17}$$

It is clear that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{S}(n)}{n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} |b_{j,\alpha-1}|, \tag{18}$$

which shows existence of the constant D in Proposition 2; in order to prove the Proposition, it is enough to show that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}(n)/(n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n) > 0$. However, this bound does not follow solely from the fact that $s(t)$ is a rational function, as the example below shows.

Example 1. *Consider the case* $p(t) = 12t^2(1-2t) + (1+2t)(1-2t+4t^2)$ *and* $q(t) = 1 - 5t + 12t^2 - 16t^3 + 8t^4 = (1-t)(1-2t)(1-2\omega t)(1-2\bar{\omega}t)$, *where* ω *is a* 6^{th} *primitive root of unity. Then* $\lambda = 2$ *and* $\alpha = 1$, *and* [5, Lemma 1] *can be used to calculate*

$$\mathfrak{S}(n) = c_n 2^n + 1 \tag{19}$$

where

$$c_n = 4 - 2\omega^n - 2\bar{\omega}^n = \begin{cases} 0, & n \equiv 0 \pmod 6 \\ 2, & n \equiv \pm 1 \pmod 6 \\ 6, & n \equiv \pm 2 \pmod 6 \\ 8, & n \equiv 3 \pmod 6 \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Note that with these values of p *and* q *one has* $\mathfrak{S}(n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ *for all* n *and* $\mathfrak{S}(0) = 1$, *as required. But as* $c_n = 0$ *for infinitely many values of* n, *one also would have* $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}(n)/(n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n) = 0$ *with this* $s(t)$. *The aim is now to show that submultiplicativity of the sequence* $(\mathfrak{S}(n))_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *gives some restrictions on the series* $s(t)$ *so that this cannot happen.*

As the $b_{j,\alpha-1}$ are non-zero and the φ_j are distinct, given (17) the following result seems highly likely:

Lemma 3. *The numbers* c_n *are real, and for some constant* $\delta > 0$, *the set*

$$\{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid c_n \geq \delta\} \tag{21}$$

is relatively dense in $[0, \infty)$.

However, the author has been unable to come up with a straightforward proof of Lemma 3 without using some additional theory on 'quasi-periodicity' of the sequence $(c_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$. One such proof is provided at the end of this section.

Assuming the Lemma, one can find an $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that for all n, there exists a $\beta = \beta_n \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$ with $c_{n+\beta} \geq \delta$. Define

$$P := \max\{\lambda^{-\beta}\mathfrak{S}(\beta) \mid 0 \leq \beta \leq N\}, \tag{22}$$

and let $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be such that for all $n \geq M$, one has

$$\mathfrak{S}(n) \geq n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \left(c_n - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \tag{23}$$

(such an M exists by (16)). Then submultiplicativity of sphere sizes implies that for all $n \geq M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{2}(n+\beta_n)^{\alpha-1}\lambda^{n+\beta_n} &\leq \left(c_{n+\beta_n} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)(n+\beta_n)^{\alpha-1}\lambda^{n+\beta_n} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{S}(n+\beta_n) \leq \mathfrak{S}(n)\mathfrak{S}(\beta_n) \leq \mathfrak{S}(n)P\lambda^{\beta_n}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

It follows that

$$\mathfrak{S}(n) \geq \frac{\delta}{2P}(n+\beta_n)^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \geq \frac{\delta}{2P}n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \tag{25}$$

for $n \geq M$, showing that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{S}(n)}{n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n} \geq \frac{\delta}{2P} > 0, \tag{26}$$

which shows existence of the constant $C > 0$ in Proposition 2. Thus in order to prove Proposition 2 it is now enough to prove Lemma 3.

Proof of Lemma 3. To prove the Lemma, one may employ a digression into a certain class of functions from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{C}$, called 'uniformly almost periodic functions'. The theory for these functions is presented in a book by Besicovitch [3].

Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, define the set $E(f, \varepsilon) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ to be the set of all numbers $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ (called the *translation numbers* for f belonging to ε) such that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |f(x+\tau) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{27}$$

The function f is said to be *uniformly almost periodic* (*u.a.p.*) if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $E(f, \varepsilon)$ is relatively dense in $\mathbb{R}$, i.e. the inclusion $E(f, \varepsilon) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quasi-isometry. It is easy to see that any periodic function is u.a.p., and that every continuous u.a.p. function is bounded.

Now note that the function

$$\begin{aligned} c : \mathbb{R} &\to \mathbb{C} \\ t &\mapsto \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_{j,\alpha-1} \exp(i\varphi_j t) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

is a sum of continuous periodic functions, and so is a continuous u.a.p. function by [3, Section 1.1, Theorem 12]. By definition, $c_n = c(n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

The aim is to show that the function $\bar{c} : t \mapsto c(\lfloor t \rfloor)$ is also u.a.p. For this, note that c is everywhere differentiable and the derivative $c'(t)$ is a sum of continuous periodic functions, so is continuous and u.a.p. – in particular, it is bounded, by some $R > 0$, say. For a given $\varepsilon \in (0, R)$, set a constant

$M := \varepsilon / \left(2 \sin\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2R}\right)\right)$ and define $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $f(t) = M \sin(\pi t)$. It is easy to check that

$$E\left(f, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \left[n - \frac{\varepsilon}{2R}, n + \frac{\varepsilon}{2R}\right]. \tag{29}$$

For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, define $n_\tau = \left\lfloor \tau + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor \in \mathbb{Z}$ to be the nearest integer to τ. Pick $\tau \in E\left(f, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \cap E\left(c, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)$ – then $|c(x+\tau) - c(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and, by (29), $|\tau - n_\tau| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2R}$, so in particular $|c(x+\tau) - c(x+n_\tau)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by the choice of R. Thus $|c(x+n_\tau) - c(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. $n_\tau \in E(c, \varepsilon)$.

But by [3, Section 1.1, Theorem 11], the set $E\left(f, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \cap E\left(c, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)$ is relatively dense, hence (by the previous paragraph) so is the set $E(c, \varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. However, for any $n \in E(c, \varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$|\bar{c}(x+n) - \bar{c}(x)| = |c(\lfloor x+n \rfloor) - c(\lfloor x \rfloor)| = |c(\lfloor x \rfloor + n) - c(\lfloor x \rfloor)| \leq \varepsilon \tag{30}$$

and so $E(c, \varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{Z} \subseteq E(\bar{c}, \varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. It follows that $E(\bar{c}, \varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is relatively dense (and so the function $\bar{c} : t \mapsto c(\lfloor t \rfloor)$ is u.a.p.).

Now recall that (17) provides constraints for limits of sequences $(\Re(c_n))$ and $(\Im(c_n))$: namely,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \Re(c_n) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \Im(c_n) = 0. \tag{31}$$

It is not hard to see that $c_n \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for all n: indeed, if either $\Re(c_n) = -\delta < 0$ or $|\Im(c_n)| = \delta > 0$ for some n then the fact that the set $E(\bar{c}, \delta/2) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is relatively dense contradicts (31). Similarly, if $c_N > 0$ for some N then the set $E(\bar{c}, \delta) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is a relatively dense set contained in $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid c(n) \geq \delta\}$, where $\delta = c_N/2$. To prove Lemma 3 it is therefore enough to show that the sequence $(c_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is not identically zero.

Now recall that the sequence (c_n) is defined by

$$c_n = \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_{j,\alpha-1} \exp(i\varphi_j n), \tag{32}$$

and suppose for contradiction that $c_n = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and in particular for $0 \leq n \leq k-1$. This is saying that $Mv = 0$, where

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \exp(i\varphi_1) & \exp(i\varphi_2) & \cdots & \exp(i\varphi_k) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \exp(i\varphi_1)^{k-1} & \exp(i\varphi_2)^{k-1} & \cdots & \exp(i\varphi_k)^{k-1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{33}$$

and

$$v = \begin{pmatrix} b_{1,\alpha-1} \\ b_{2,\alpha-1} \\ \vdots \\ b_{k,\alpha-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{34}$$

Thus M has a zero eigenvalue and so $\det M = 0$. But M^t is a Vandermonde matrix with pairwise distinct rows, so $\det M \neq 0$. This gives a contradiction which completes the proof. $\square$

3. Degree of commutativity

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 1. For this, let Γ be a finite graph. If Γ is complete, then G_Γ is a free abelian group and so $\mathrm{dc}_X(G_\Gamma) = 1$ for any generating set X. Hence one may assume without loss of generality that Γ is not complete. In particular, $G = G_\Gamma$ is a non-abelian (moreover, exponentially growing) group. One thus aims to show that $\mathrm{dc}_{V(\Gamma)}(G) = 0$.

Suppose for contradiction that $\mathrm{dc}_{V(\Gamma)}(G_\Gamma) > 0$. That means that for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$, one has

$$\sum_{g \in B(n)} \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)^2} \geq \varepsilon \tag{35}$$

for infinitely many values of n, where $C_G(g)$ denotes the centraliser of an element $g \in G$ and $\mathfrak{B}(n) = \mathfrak{B}_G(n) = \mathfrak{B}_{G,X}(n) := |B_{G,X}(n)|$ for $X = V(\Gamma)$.

In the proof minimal length conjugates of elements in G will be considered. In particular, by [6, Section II, Proposition] any $g \in G$ has a unique conjugate $\tilde{g} \in G$, called the *cyclic reduction* of g, such that $g = p_g^{-1}\tilde{g}p_g$ and such that $|\tilde{g}|$ is minimal among all the conjugates; moreover, for such elements we have $|g| = 2|p_g| + |\tilde{g}|$. Such an element $\tilde{g}$ is called *cyclicly reduced*, and a subset $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ is called the *support* of $\tilde{g}$, written $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g})$, if the set of letters used in (any) word of length $|\tilde{g}|$ representing $\tilde{g}$ is precisely A. Finally, for any subset $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ one may define its *link* to be

$$\mathrm{link}\, A = \{x \in V(\Gamma) \mid xy \in E(\Gamma) \text{ for all } y \in A\}. \tag{36}$$

The proof now can be divided into the following steps:

(i) showing that one may restrict their consideration of centralisers of elements $g \in G$ only to elements such that the support of their cyclic reduction is some fixed subset $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$;
(ii) proving that a generic element $g \in G$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A$ has $|p_g|$ 'small';
(iii) showing, based on step (ii), that $\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(A)},A}(n)$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\mathrm{link}\, A)},\mathrm{link}\, A}(n)$ are both bounded away from zero by constant multiples of $\mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma,V(\Gamma)}(n)$ for n arbitrarily large;
(iv) obtaining a contradiction based on the fact that $G_{\Gamma(A)} \times G_{\Gamma(\mathrm{link}\, A)}$ is a special subgroup of G_Γ (by definition of link).

Before carrying on with the proof, consider the sequence $(d_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ where

$$d_n := \frac{|\{(x,y) \in B_{G,V(\Gamma)}(n)^2 \mid [x,y] = 1\}|}{\mathfrak{B}_{G,V(\Gamma)}(n)^2}. \tag{37}$$

One aims to show that $d_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Note that for many groups of exponential growth, including all the non-elementary hyperbolic groups [1], the sequence $(d_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ converges to zero exponentially. However, the following example shows that this is not the case for some right-angled Artin groups. The result of Theorem 1 may be therefore more delicate than one might think.

Example 2. *Suppose* Γ *is a complete bipartite graph* $K_{m,m}$*, i.e.* Γ *has vertex set*

$$V(\Gamma) = \{x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m\} \tag{38}$$

and edge set

$$E(\Gamma) = \{(x_i, y_j) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}. \tag{39}$$

In this case $G_\Gamma = F_m \times F_m$ *(direct product of two free groups of rank* m*) and so one can calculate sphere sizes in* G_Γ *and its special subgroups easily. Note that clearly (by the definition of link) every element of* $G_{\Gamma(A)}$ *commutes with every element of* $G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}$*. Now consider the case where* $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ *and so* $\operatorname{link} A = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$*. It follows that*

$$\{(x, y) \in B(n)^2 \mid [x, y] = 1\} \subseteq B_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n) \times B_{G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}}(n). \tag{40}$$

An explicit computation shows that

$$\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n) = \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}}(n) = \frac{m(2m-1)^n - 1}{m-1} \tag{41}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(n) = \frac{2m^2 n(2m-1)^n}{(m-1)(2m-1)} + e_1(2m-1)^n + e_2 \tag{42}$$

where e_1, e_2 *are some constants that depend on* m*. It follows that*

$$d_n \geq \frac{\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n)\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}}(n)}{\mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(n)^2} \sim \left(\frac{2m-1}{2mn}\right)^2 \tag{43}$$

as $n \to \infty$*. In particular, the sequence* $(d_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ *converges to zero only polynomially for* G_Γ*.*

One now may carry out steps (i)–(iv) above as follows. For step (i), note that (35) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{A \subseteq V(\Gamma)} \sum_{\substack{g \in B(n) \\ \operatorname{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A}} \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)^2} \geq \varepsilon \tag{44}$$

and so (44) holds for infinitely many n. But as Γ is finite, there are only $2^{|V(\Gamma)|} < \infty$ subsets of $V(\Gamma)$, thus in particular there exists a subset $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{g \in B(n) \\ \operatorname{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A}} \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)^2} \geq 2^{-|V(\Gamma)|}\varepsilon \tag{45}$$

holds for infinitely many n. This completes step (i).

For step (ii), one may use Proposition 2. In particular, as G has rational spherical growth series by [2], the Proposition says that there exist constants $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $\lambda \geq 1$, $C = C_G > 0$ and $D = D_G > C$ such that

$$Cn^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \leq \mathfrak{S}(n) \leq Dn^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \tag{46}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. As it is also assumed that G has exponential growth, one has $\lambda > 1$. It is easy to show that in this case

$$Cn^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n < \mathfrak{B}(n) < \frac{D\lambda}{\lambda-1}n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \tag{47}$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Now one can bound the number of terms in (45) corresponding to elements $g \in G$ with $|p_g|$ large (even without requiring $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A$). Indeed, as any $g \in G$ can be written as $g = p_g^{-1}\tilde{g}p_g$ with $|g| = 2|p_g| + |\tilde{g}|$, (46) and (47) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} \sum_{\substack{g \in B(n) \\ |p_g| > s}} \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} &\leq \frac{|\{g \in B(n) \mid |p_g| > s\}|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=s+1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \frac{\mathfrak{S}(i)\mathfrak{B}(n-2i)}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} \qquad (48) \\
&\leq \frac{D}{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\alpha-1}\lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}} + \frac{D^2\lambda}{C(\lambda-1)} \sum_{i=s+1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} \left(\frac{i(n-2i)}{n}\right)^{\alpha-1}\lambda^{-i}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term of the sum above clearly tends to zero, and the second term is bounded above by the infinite sum $\sum_{i=s+1}^{\infty} i^{\alpha-1}\lambda^{-i}$, which tends to zero as $s \to \infty$ since the series $\sum_i i^{\alpha-1}\lambda^{-i}$ converges. Hence there exists a value of $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which ensures that the right hand side in (48) is less than $2^{-|V(\Gamma)|-1}\varepsilon$ for n large enough. This means that

$$\sum_{\substack{g \in B(n) \\ \mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A \\ |p_g| \leq s}} \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)^2} \geq \tilde{\varepsilon} \tag{49}$$

for infinitely many n (where $\tilde{\varepsilon} := 2^{-|V(\Gamma)|-1}\varepsilon > 0$), completing step (ii).

For step (iii), note that one may write

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{g \in B(n) \\ \mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A \\ |p_g| \leq s}} \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)^2} &\leq \frac{|\{g \in B(n) \mid \mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A, |p_g| \leq s\}|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} \\
&\times \max\left\{ \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} \;\middle|\; g \in B(n), \mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A, |p_g| \leq s \right\} \qquad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

where both terms in the product are bounded above by 1. It follows by (49) that both

$$\frac{|\{g \in B(n) \mid \mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A, |p_g| \leq s\}|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} \geq \tilde{\varepsilon} \tag{$*$}$$

and

$$\max\left\{ \frac{|C_G(g) \cap B(n)|}{\mathfrak{B}(n)} \;\middle|\; g \in B(n), \mathrm{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A, |p_g| \leq s \right\} \geq \tilde{\varepsilon} \tag{$\dagger$}$$

hold for infinitely many n.

We claim now that $(*)$ and $(\dagger)$ imply that subgroups $G_{\Gamma(A)}$ and $G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}$ (respectively) are visible in G_Γ.

For $(*)$, note that the set in the numerator consists of elements $g \in B_G(n)$ which have an expression $g = p_g^{-1}\tilde{g}p_g$ with $p_g \in B_{G_\Gamma}(s)$ and $\tilde{g} \in B_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n)$. It follows that

$$|\{g \in B(n) \mid \operatorname{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A, |p_g| \leq s\}| \leq \mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(s)\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n) \tag{51}$$

and so $(*)$ implies that

$$\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(s)} \leq \frac{\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n)}{\mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(n)} \leq 1 \tag{$**$}$$

for infinitely many n, where the second inequality comes from the fact that $B_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n) \subseteq B_{G_\Gamma}(n)$.

For $(\dagger)$, one needs to consider forms of centralisers of elements $g \in G$ with $\operatorname{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A$. Firstly, fix an element $g \in G$ with $\operatorname{supp}(\tilde{g}) = A$ and note that one clearly has $C_G(g) = p_g^{-1}C_G(\tilde{g})p_g$, so if $|p_g| \leq s$ then one has

$$|C_G(g) \cap B(n)| \leq |C_G(\tilde{g}) \cap B(n + 2s)|. \tag{52}$$

Secondly, let $A_1, \ldots, A_k \subseteq A$ form a partition of A such that the graphs $\Gamma(A_i)^c$ are precisely the connected components of the graph $\Gamma(A)^c$. Then the Centraliser Theorem [6] says that one has

$$C_G(\tilde{g}) = \langle h_1 \rangle \times \cdots \times \langle h_k \rangle \times G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)} \tag{53}$$

where the $h_i \in G$ are some cyclicly reduced elements with $\operatorname{supp}(h_i) = A_i$.

Now pick any vertices $a_i \in A_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and let

$$\tilde{A} := \{a_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} \cup \operatorname{link} A. \tag{54}$$

Define the homomorphism $\varphi : G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})} \to C_G(\tilde{g})$ by extending the map

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi|_{\tilde{A}} : \tilde{A} &\to C_G(\tilde{g}), \\ a_i &\mapsto h_i \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ x &\mapsto x \quad \text{for } x \in \operatorname{link} A. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

It is easy to see that φ is a well-defined isomorphism. The aim is now to show that if $C_G(\tilde{g})$ is equipped with the restriction of word metric in G, then φ^{-1} is a 1-Lipschitz map, i.e. that one has $|\varphi^{-1}(h)|_{\tilde{A}} \leq |h|_{V(\Gamma)}$ for each $h \in C_G(\tilde{g})$. Indeed, let $h \in C_G(\tilde{g})$; since any vertex in $A_i = \operatorname{supp}(h_i)$ is connected by an edge to any vertex of A_j for $j \neq i$ or of $\operatorname{link} A$, it follows that one has an expression

$$h = h_1^{\beta_1} \cdots h_k^{\beta_k} \bar{h} \tag{56}$$

for some $\beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\bar{h} \in G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}$. Since the A_i are disjoint from each other and from $\operatorname{link} A$, one can choose words representing $\bar{h}$ and the $h_i^{\beta_i}$ so that (56) gives a *graphically reduced* expresion for h, i.e. the corresponding word representing h has length $|h|$. In particular, one has

$$|h| = \left|h_1^{\beta_1}\right| + \cdots + \left|h_k^{\beta_k}\right| + \left|\bar{h}\right|. \tag{57}$$

To show that φ^{-1} is 1-Lipschitz it is therefore enough to show that $\left|h_i^\beta\right| \geq |\beta|$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and for all $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}$. But since the h_i are cyclicly reduced, the element h_i^β is graphically reduced as written, and in particular $\left|h_i^\beta\right| = |\beta||h_i|$: indeed, otherwise [6] shows that $h_i = u_1 x^{-\eta} v_1 = u_2 x^\eta v_2$ for some $x \in V(\Gamma)$ commuting with $\mathrm{supp}(v_1) \cup \mathrm{supp}(u_2)$ and $\eta \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that $|u_j| + |v_j| = |h_i| - 1$ (for $j = 1, 2$), but then $|x^{-\eta} h_i x^\eta| = |h_i| - 2$, contradicting the fact that h_i is cyclicly reduced. As $|h_i| \geq 1$ for all i, it indeed follows that φ^{-1} is 1-Lipschitz. In particular, this implies

$$|C_G(\tilde{g}) \cap B(n)| \leq \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(n) \tag{58}$$

which together with (52) and submultiplicativity of ball sizes implies that

$$|C_G(g) \cap B(n)| \leq \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(n + 2s) \leq \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(n) \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(2s). \tag{59}$$

In particular, (†) implies that

$$\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(2s)} \leq \frac{\mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(n)}{\mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(n)} \leq 1 \tag{††}$$

for infinitely many n, where the second inequality comes from the fact that $B_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(n) \subseteq B_{G_\Gamma}(n)$.

To conclude step (iii) and to complete step (iv), one might employ the following Lemma:

Lemma 4. *Let H (resp. K) be an infinite group with a finite generating set X (resp. Y) and suppose that there exist constants $\alpha_H, \alpha_K \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $\lambda_H, \lambda_K \in [1, \infty)$ and $D > C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} C n^{\alpha_H - 1} \lambda_H^n \leq & \mathfrak{S}_{H,X}(n) \leq D n^{\alpha_H - 1} \lambda_H^n \\ \text{and} \quad C n^{\alpha_K - 1} \lambda_K^n \leq & \mathfrak{S}_{K,Y}(n) \leq D n^{\alpha_K - 1} \lambda_K^n \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Suppose w.l.o.g. that 'H grows faster than K', i.e. $\lambda_H \geq \lambda_K$ and if $\lambda_H = \lambda_K$ then $\alpha_H \geq \alpha_K$. Then one has

$$\mathfrak{S}_{H \times K, X \sqcup Y}(n) \leq \widetilde{D} n^{\alpha_H - 1} \lambda_H^n \tag{61}$$

for all $n \geq 1$ (for some constant $\widetilde{D} > 0$) if and only if $\lambda_H > \lambda_K$.

Given the Lemma, the proof can be finalised as follows. Recall (cf (46) and (47)) that one has constants $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $\lambda > 1$ and $D_{V(\Gamma)} > C_{V(\Gamma)} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{V(\Gamma)} n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n \leq & \mathfrak{S}_{G_\Gamma}(n) \leq D_{V(\Gamma)} n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n \\ \text{and} \quad C_{V(\Gamma)} n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n < & \mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(n) < \frac{D_{V(\Gamma)} \lambda}{\lambda - 1} n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Now (∗∗) implies that, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\widetilde{C}_A n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n \leq \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(A)}}(n) \leq \widetilde{D}_A n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n \tag{∗∗∗}$$

for some $\widetilde{D}_A > \widetilde{C}_A > 0$ and (††) implies that, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\widetilde{C}_{\tilde{A}} n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n \leq \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}}(n) \leq \widetilde{D}_{\tilde{A}} n^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^n \tag{63}$$

for some $\widetilde{D}_{\tilde{A}} > \widetilde{C}_{\tilde{A}} > 0$, and in particular that $G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}$ has exponential growth. By the construction one has $G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})} = G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)} \times H$ where $H \cong \mathbb{Z}^k$ is a special subgroup of $G = G_\Gamma$ generated by the vertices $\{a_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\}$; in particular, as $G_{\Gamma(\tilde{A})}$ has exponential growth so does $G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}$. But as both $G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}$ and H are special subgroups of G, they are right-angled Artin groups on their own right, so in particular they have rational spherical growth series. As H has only polynomial growth, it then follows from Proposition 2, Lemma 4 and (63) that, for $n \geq 1$

$$(\dagger\dagger\dagger) \qquad \widetilde{C}_{\operatorname{link} A} n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n \leq \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}}(n) \leq \widetilde{D}_{\operatorname{link} A} n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n$$

for some $\widetilde{D}_{\operatorname{link} A} > \widetilde{C}_{\operatorname{link} A} > 0$. Equations $(***)$ and $(\dagger\dagger\dagger)$ then conclude step (iii).

Finally, step (iv) follows easily from Lemma 4. For this, note that the group $G_{\Gamma(A \cup \operatorname{link} A)} = G_{\Gamma(A)} \times G_{\Gamma(\operatorname{link} A)}$ is a special subgroup of G_Γ and so one has $B_{G_{\Gamma(A\cup\operatorname{link} A)}}(n) \subseteq B_{G_\Gamma}(n)$. It then follows from $(***)$, $(\dagger\dagger\dagger)$ and Lemma 4 that for any $\widetilde{D} > 0$ one has

$$(64) \qquad \mathfrak{B}_{G_\Gamma}(n) \geq \mathfrak{B}_{G_{\Gamma(A\cup\operatorname{link} A)}}(n) \geq \widetilde{D} n^{\alpha-1}\lambda^n$$

for some n, which contradicts (62). This completes step (iv) and hence the proof of Theorem 1.

Thus in order to prove Theorem 1 it is enough to give a proof of Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 4. Suppose first that $\lambda_H > \lambda_K$. Clearly it is enough to show that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}_{H\times K}(n)/(n^{\alpha_H-1}\lambda_H^n) < \infty$. But for all $n \geq 1$ one has

$$(65) \qquad \begin{aligned} \frac{\mathfrak{S}_{H\times K}(n)}{n^{\alpha_H-1}\lambda_H^n} &= \frac{1}{n^{\alpha_H-1}\lambda_H^n}\sum_{i=0}^{n} \mathfrak{S}_H(n-i)\mathfrak{S}_K(i) \\ &\leq D^2\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_K}{\lambda_H}\right)^i \left(\frac{n-i}{n}\right)^{\alpha_H-1} i^{\alpha_K-1} + \left(\frac{\lambda_K}{\lambda_H}\right)^n n^{\alpha_K-\alpha_H}\right). \end{aligned}$$

As $\lambda_K/\lambda_H < 1$, limit of the first (resp. third) term above as $n \to \infty$ is clearly D^2 (resp. 0). The second term can be bounded above by an upper bound for the series $\sum_i D^2(\lambda_K/\lambda_H)^i i^{\alpha_K-1}$, which converges by the ratio test. Hence indeed $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}_{H\times K}(n)/(n^{\alpha_H-1}\lambda_H^n) < \infty$, which implies the result.

Suppose now that $\lambda_H = \lambda_K =: \lambda$. Let $n \geq 20$, so that $\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil \leq n/4$. Then

$$(66) \qquad \begin{aligned} \frac{\mathfrak{S}_{H\times K}(n)}{n^{\alpha_H-1}\lambda^n} &= \frac{1}{n^{\alpha_H-1}\lambda^n}\sum_{i=0}^{n} \mathfrak{S}_H(n-i)\mathfrak{S}_K(i) \\ &\geq C^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(\frac{n-i}{n}\right)^{\alpha_H-1} i^{\alpha_K-1} \geq C^2 \sum_{i=\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\alpha_H-1} (\sqrt{n})^{\alpha_K-1} \\ &\geq C^2 2^{-(\alpha_H+1)} n^{\frac{\alpha_K-1}{2}+1}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, one has $\mathfrak{S}_{H\times K}(n)/(n^{\alpha_H-1}\lambda_H^n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, implying the result. □

References

[1] Y. Antolín, A. Martino, and E. Ventura. Degree of commutativity of infinite groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145:479–485, 2017.
[2] J.S. Athreya and A. Prasad. Growth in right-angled groups and monoids. Preprint, available at arXiv:1409.4142 [math.GR], 2014.
[3] A.S. Besicovitch. *Almost periodic functions*. Dover publications, 1954.
[4] R. Charney. An introduction to right-angled Artin groups. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 125(1):141–158, 2007.
[5] D.V. Lee. On the power-series expansion of a rational function. *Acta Arith.*, LXII(3):229–255, 1992.
[6] H. Servatius. Automorphisms of graph groups. *J. Algebra*, 126(1):34–60, 1989.

Department of Mathematics, University of Southampton, University Road, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK

E-mail address: m.valiunas@soton.ac.uk